Astronomy & Astrophysics manuscript no. vpec
March 4, 2016
©ESO 2016

Peculiar velocity measurement in a clumpy universe

Farhang Habibi[1,3], Shant Baghram[2], and Saeed Tavasoli[3]

[1] LAL, IN2P3-CNRS, B.P. 34, 91898 Orsay Cedex, France
e-mail: habibi@lal.in2p3.fr
[2] Department of Physics, Sharif University of Technology, P. O. Box 11155-9161, Tehran, Iran
e-mail: baghram@sharif.edu
[3] Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM), P. O. Box 19395-5531, Tehran, Iran
e-mail: tavasoli@ipm.ir

arXiv:1412.8457v2 [astro-ph.CO] 3 Mar 2016

ABSTRACT

At low redshifts, deviations of the measured luminosity distance from the background FRW universe can be attributed to peculiar velocities of galaxies. Via observing the cosmic standard candles, this is one of the conventional ways to estimate peculiar velocities with given cosmological parameters in ΛCDM framework. However, at intermediate redshifts ($0.5 < z < 2$), deviations from the background FRW model are not uniquely governed by peculiar velocities. Luminosity distances are modified by gravitational lensing which affects the light trajectories. Hence, using the conventional peculiar velocity method, that ignores the lensing effect, will result in an overestimate of the measured peculiar velocities at intermediate redshifts. Here we quantify this effect. We show that at low redshifts the lensing effect is negligible compare to the effect of peculiar velocity. From the observational point of view, we show that the uncertainties on luminosity of the present SNe Ia data prevent us from precise measuring the peculiar velocities even at low redshifts ($z < 0.2$).

1. Inroduction

The propagation of the light from standard candles, such as supernovae type Ia (SNe Ia), from the source to the observer is of greatest interest for cosmology. On one hand, standard candles are used to measure the rate of the expansion of the universe (1; 2). On the the other hand, the amount of light bundle distortion of the source is used to measure the gravitational effect of the matter distribution along the line of sight, which helps us to learn about the distribution and evolution of the matter in different cosmic times and scales(3; 4). Another phenomenon which has an important effect on the measurement of the magnitude of the standard candle and its interpretation is the peculiar velocity. This is because the peculiar velocity changes the redshift of the source (5). The host galaxies of standard candles has an additional velocity beside the Hubble expansion velocity. Although the existence of peculiar velocity makes ambiguity in the measurement of the cosmological redshift, however it is used as a promising tool to probe the matter distribution, this is becuase the peculiar velocity of matter is sourced by the change in the matter perturbation due to continuity equation. Accordingly the peculiar velocity of luminous matter (i.e. galaxies) can be used as a tracer of the dark matter distribution in the Universe. As future large-scale structure surveys will open up a great opportunity to map the Universe on larger scales and at deeper redshifts, peculiar velocity measurements, lensing maps of the Universe and distance measurements of standard candles become progressively more important(6). These observations can be used as a probe to check the standard model of cosmology or to see any deviations from ΛCDM (7). Accordingly, the accurate measurement of these quantities, their hidden relations and their model dependencies have great importance. Historically, the peculiar velocities are obtained by the relation $v_p = cz - Hr$, where v_p is the peculiar velocity, z is the observed redshift, H is the value of Hubble parameter and r is the physical distance to the source respectively and $\bar{v} = Hr$ is the velocity of the Hubble flow (8; 9; 10; 11; 12; 13; 14; 15). Using the peculiar velocity relation one can measure the distances to the sources and having the observed redshifts, the peculiar velocity can be deduced. However, distance measurement is a non-trivial exercise and there are many different methods to do this. The Tully-Fisher relation for spirals(16), surface brightness fluctuations for nearby galaxies(17), the Faber-Jackson relation for elliptical galaxies(18), the tip of the Red Giant Branch, Cepheids, and SNe Ia are the most developed methods to measure the distances(19). In this work, first we reexamine the luminosity distance measurements in a clumpy universe by accounting for the lensing (22; 23; 24; 25), Sachs-Wolfe and Integrated Sachs-Wolfe effects (20). Then we demonstrate the relativistic approach to measuring peculiar velocities similar to the one presented in Davis and Scrimgeour (21), and finally we take into account both relativistic corrections and lensing corrections to luminosity distance computation in ΛCDM framework. In this work, we also study the physics of the peculiar velocity measurment, where we show that the distance measurement methods which assume that the observed distance to a host galaxy is equal to its proper distance are all biased. This bias comes from the fact that deviation from unperturbed FRW Universe is not considered in distance measurement. In other words, the over/under dense regions along the line of sight affect the luminosity of the standard candle. Accordingly we assert that the distance-independent measurments, like pe-

culiar velocity measurements by redshift-space distortions, linear theory or kinetic Sunyaev-Zeldovich effect are more unbiased observation to find the peculiar velocity. Although with the nowadays data, we currently have larger errors using these methods(26), the results of this study will be important to be applied in future Large Scale Structure (LSS) surveys, which probe the Universe in higher redshifts, where the unbiased measurement of the distances become important. The structure of this work is as follow: In the first subsection of Sec.(2) we study the Luminosity distance in clumpy Universe without peculiar velocity. In the second subsection we study the case of peculiar velocity as a redshift redefinition parameter and in the third subsection we take into account the physics of both peculiar velocity and gravitational lensing. In Sec.(3) we have the conclusion and future prospects.

2. Luminosity distance

In a homogenous-isotropic universe with FRW metric:

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + a^2(t)d\sigma^2 \tag{1}$$

where $d\sigma^2 = d\chi^2 + f_K^2(\chi)[d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2]$ is the spatial line element and f_K is:

$$f_K(\chi) = \begin{cases} \sin\chi & \text{if } K = +1 \\ \chi & \text{if } K = 0 \\ \sinh\chi & \text{if } K = -1 \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

where χ is the comoving distance and K is the space curvature. We can measure the cosmological parameters by measuring the luminosity distance of the standard candles such as SNe Ia. The luminosity distance d_L is defined as the ratio of the absolute luminosity L_s of the source to the observed flux $\mathcal{F}$, by:

$$d_L^2 = \frac{L_s}{4\pi\mathcal{F}}. \tag{3}$$

The luminosity distance in the flat-FRW model is related to comoving distance by:

$$\bar{d_L}(\bar{z}) = (1+\bar{z})\chi(\bar{z}) = (1+\bar{z})\int_0^{\bar{z}} \frac{cdz'}{H(z')}, \tag{4}$$

where $\bar{d_L}(\bar{z})$ is the background luminosity distance (luminosity distance in the unperturbed universe described by FRW metric) at background (or cosmological) redshift $\bar{z}$. Note that hereafter $\bar{}$ indicates the background quantity. The background luminosity distance is related to the distance modulus by:

$$\bar{\mu} = m - M = 5\log(\bar{d_L}(\bar{z})) + 25, \tag{5}$$

where m and M are the apparent and absolute magnitudes of a standard candle (such as SNe Ia) and in this case d_L is measured in Mpc units and μ can be interpreted as a distance indicator (amount of magnitude change), interchangeably.

In the first subsection, we study the distance measurement case, in a clumpy universe with change in the background redshift. In the second subsection, we study the case of unperturbed Universe with the inclusion of the effects that change the observed background redshift like peculiar velocity. This will be done in relativistic manner and finally in the third subsection we study both the effect of peculiar velocity and convergence on the luminosity distance measurement.

2.1. Luminosity distance in a clumpy universe with zero peculiar velocities

The Universe is not exactly homogenous and isotropic. The cosmic structures include over-dense (galaxies, groups and clusters of galaxies) and under-dense (voids) regions which makes the Universe to differ from being a FRW spacetime. Hence, we should consider a perturbed metric for the clumpy Universe in order to investigate the propagation of light through voids and over-dense regions. We use the perturbed FRW-metric in Newtonian gauge:

$$ds^2 = -(1+2\Psi(\boldsymbol{x},t))c^2dt^2 + a^2(t)(1-2\Phi(\boldsymbol{x},t))d\sigma^2, \tag{6}$$

where $\Psi(\boldsymbol{x},t)$ and $\Phi(\boldsymbol{x},t)$ are the perturbed scalars. In the case that we have the general relativity as the classical theory of gravity and the assumption that the cosmic fluid does not have an anisotropic terms in its energy-momentum tensor, we have $\Psi = \Phi$.

In order to study the effect of inhomogeneities on the propagation of the light bundle we have to solve the Sachs equation (3):

$$\frac{d^2}{d\chi^2}d_L = -\frac{1}{2}R_{\mu\nu}k^\mu k^\nu d_L, \tag{7}$$

where we replaced the angular diameter distance with luminosity distance as in metric theories we have $d_L = (1+z)^2 d_A$. $R_{\mu\nu}$ is the Ricci tensor and k^μ is the four momentum of photon which is defined by using the background comoving distance as the affine parameter $k^\mu = dx^\mu/d\chi$. Using the Sachs equation the luminosity distance in perturbed universe $d_L(\bar{z})$ becomes:

$$d_L(\bar{z}) = \bar{d}_L(\bar{z})\left[1 + \frac{\delta d_L}{\bar{d}_L(\bar{z})}\right], \tag{8}$$

where $\delta d_L/\bar{d}_L(\bar{z})$ is the change of the luminosity distance with respect to the FRW prediction, due to effect of structures along the line of sight. The $\delta d_L/\bar{d}_L(\bar{z})$ is as below (20):

$$\frac{\delta d_L}{\bar{d}_L}|_{\chi_s} = \hat{n}.\boldsymbol{v}_0/c - \Phi_s + \frac{1}{\chi_s}\int_0^{\chi_s} d\chi_s(2\Phi - (\chi-\chi_s)\chi\nabla_\perp^2\Phi), \tag{9}$$

where $\boldsymbol{v}_0$ is the peculiar velocity of the observer, $\hat{n}$ is the unit vector from the observer toward the source, Φ_s is the gravitational potential of the host and χ_s is the comoving distance to source respectively. The 2 dimensional Laplacian is defied as $(\nabla_\perp^2 = \nabla^2 - (\hat{n}.\boldsymbol{\nabla})^2 + 2\hat{n}.\boldsymbol{\nabla}/\chi)$. It is worth to mention that there is no term related to the peculiar

velocity of source in luminosity distance change obtained Eq.(9). The other important thing to indicate is that a crucial term in the luminosity distance change is the lensing convergence κ_g term, which is defined from the second term of the integral in Eq.(9) as:

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_g &= \int_0^{\chi_s} d\chi(\chi_s-\chi)\frac{\chi}{\chi_s}\nabla_\perp^2\Phi \\ &\simeq \frac{3}{2}H_0^2\Omega_m\int_0^{\chi_s} d\chi(\chi_s-\chi)\frac{\chi}{\chi_s}(1+z_s)\delta_m(\chi),\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where the second equation is an approximation because we exchange the 2D Laplacian with that in 3D. We use the Poisson equation to replace the Φ with density contrast δ_m, which depends on the comoving distance. Ω_m is the matter density parameter in the present time.

In the case that we can neglect the potential terms with respect to the convergence term, the luminosity distance of the standard candles will be modified as below:

$$d_L(\bar{z}) = \bar{d}_L(\bar{z})[1-\kappa_g(\bar{z})], \tag{11}$$

where $d_L(\bar{z})$ is the observed luminosity distance at comoving redshift, $\bar{z}$, produced by the Hubble expansion. The κ_g is the gravitational lensing correction obtained from the line of sight integration of the matter density contrast as in Eq.(10)(3). We should note that gravitational lensing only change the source apparent magnitude and do not affect the redshift of the source. Therefore, in the absence of peculiar velocities, the observed redshift is the same as the comoving redshift: $z = \bar{z}$.

An important example of a host galaxy with no peculiar velocity is the one that resides at the center of a cosmic void or center of a galaxy cluster (a Brightest Central Galaxy (BCG)).

In addition, in relation (9), there are two gravitational potential terms other than κ_g that can affect the observed luminosity. In the next section, we will include the effect of gravitational potential change on the source luminosity and will show that at low and intermediate redshifts this effect is negligible.

2.2. Luminosity distance with peculiar velocity as an example of redshift redefinition

At low redshifts ($z < 0.1$), the line-of-sight effects do not significantly affect the light bundle of the standard candles. In order to confirm this assertion, we consider the fact that the variance of the κ_g is related to the matter power spectrum via Eq.(10). We plot this theoretical variance of κ_g versus redshift in Fig. 1. According to the figure, at low redshifts $\kappa_g \sim 10^{-3}$. By using relation (11), this creates a typical distance modulus fluctuation of $\sim 10^{-3}$ magnitude. As we will see in this section, this fluctuation is negligible in comparison to the fluctuation produces by peculiar velocity which is at order of 0.1 magnitude. The peculiar velocities of the sources, produced by the local density contrast (as in the case of a SNe Ia host galaxy which resides in infalling regions in a galaxy group), can have a dominant effect on the luminosity distance computed by background



Fig. 1. Red curve shows the change of the theoretical variance of κ_g versus redshift. Blue curve represents the variation of κ_v for v_p=1000 km/s as a function of redshift. Gravitational lensing stars dominating the peculiar velocity after $z \sim 0.35$. The curves are plotted for a flat ΛCDM universe with Ω_m=0.27 and H_0=70 km/s/Mpc.

ΛCDM model through changing the redshift from $\bar{z}$ to z. This redshift distortion can be *corrected* to reproduce the background model by Taylor expansion of Eq.(4) around the observed redshift z:

$$\bar{d}_L(\bar{z}) = \bar{d}_L(z) + \frac{\partial \bar{d}_L}{\partial \bar{z}}|_z(\bar{z}-z). \tag{12}$$

The non-zero $\bar{z}-z$ is produced by the peculiar velocity of the source. However in order to take all the terms that contribute to the redshift redefinition, we have to solve the volume expansion equation (3):

$$\frac{dz}{d\chi} = [-\frac{\Theta}{3} + \sigma_{\mu\nu}n^\mu n^\nu](1+z)^2 \tag{13}$$

where Θ is the expansion parameter, $\sigma_{\mu\nu}$ is anisotropic stress and n^μ is normal 4-vectors. Solving the Eq.(13)we will get:

$$\frac{z-\bar{z}}{1+\bar{z}} = z_p - z_{SW}/2 - 2\int_0^{\chi_s} d\chi\Phi', \tag{14}$$

where z_p is the peculiar redshift due to the peculiar velocity of the source and $z_{SW} = 2(\Phi_s - \Phi_0)$ is the redshift induced by Sachs-Wolf effect. The gravitational potential can be estimated as $\Phi \sim (v_s/c)^2$ where v is the dispersion velocity of the source host galaxy. At intermediate and low redshifts $z_{SW} \ll z_p$.

Neglecting the gravitational potential contribution, we focus our attention to the peculiar velocity as the main source of the redshift deviation from the background redshift. Using the relativistic peculiar redshift, we have:

$$1 + z_p = \sqrt{\frac{1+(v_p/c)}{1-(v_p/c)}}, \tag{15}$$



Fig. 2. The solid curve represents relation (23). The symbols show peculiar redshifts of SNe computed non-relativistically through relation (18) and substituted in κ_v relation. The deviation from the relativistic curve increases by redshift.

where c is the light speed. v_p is the peculiar velocity along the line of sight which is related to the source proper motion through relation $v_p = \hat{n}.\boldsymbol{v}_s$, where $\hat{n}$ is the unit vector pointing from the observer to the source. One should note that the equation above is valid for measuring any relativistic velocity. In order to formulate the v_p, we start with the definition of physical distance $r = a\chi$, where $a = 1/(1+z)$ is the scale factor. We neglectthe gravitational potential corrections on proper distance measurement. Consequently, the observed velocity in non-relativistic limit is written as:

$$v = \bar{v} + v_p \tag{16}$$

where $\bar{v}$ is the cosmological Hubble velocity ($\bar{v} = Hr$) . In order to relate the peculiar velocity v_p to the observed redshift z and the unperturbed cosmological redshift $\bar{z}$, we use the relativistic relation (21)

$$v = c\frac{(1+z)^2 - 1}{(1+z)^2 + 1}, \tag{17}$$

which in the non-relativistic limit reduces to $v \simeq cz$ and gives the well known but approximate relation:

$$v_p \simeq cz - Hd_L(z). \tag{18}$$

where we have approximated $r(z)$ by the luminosity distance $d_L(z)$. In (21), they show that the relation $v \simeq cz$ introduces accountable errors even at low redshift. The correct relation between the redshifts is as below:

$$(1+z) = (1+\bar{z})(1+z_p). \tag{19}$$

The relation $z \simeq \bar{z} + z_p$ works only at low redshifts and small peculiar velocities. The equation (19) can be derived by considering how two different inertial observers, located at any co-moving distance from each other on the Hubble flow, measure the wavelength emitted by a source with a peculiar motion. The important task now is to find the peculiar velocity (or equivalently the peculiar redshift z_p). By computing the derivative of equation (4) and substituting $\bar{z} - z$ from equation (14) (where we neglect the potential related terms), the equation (12) becomes as:

$$\bar{d}_L(\bar{z}) = \bar{d}_L(z)\,[1 - \kappa_v]\,, \tag{20}$$

where by considering the GR corrections described by (4):

$$\kappa_v = \left(\frac{c(1+z)}{\chi(z)H(z)} - 1\right)\frac{z_p}{1+z_p}. \tag{21}$$

We rewrite relation (20) in distance modulus form:

$$\bar{\mu}(\bar{z}) = \bar{\mu}(z) + 5\log\left[1 - \kappa_v\right]. \tag{22}$$

One observes the distance modulus, $\mu(z)$, of a standard candle at observed redshift z and assumes that the measured luminosity belongs to the non-distorted redshift $\bar{z}$ and put $\mu(z) = \bar{\mu}(\bar{z})$ (redshift distortion does not affect the background luminosity of the source). We hence re-write the relation (22) as:

$$\Delta\mu(z) = \mu(z) - \bar{\mu}(z) = 5\log\left[1 - \kappa_v\right]. \tag{23}$$

$\Delta\mu(z)$ is the deviation of the observed luminosity from the background model at the observed redshift z.

It is interesting to note that for a given cosmology and a given peculiar velocity, κ_v changes sign at redshift $z_* \sim 1.5$ At redshifts $z < z_*$, if the source is moving toward us it is observed to be fainter than what model predicts. This will be inverse for the same object at redshifts $z > z_*$. In general, depending on the source redshift and the direction of the source along the line of sight, the source will look brighter or fainter than what the model predicts. Since this effect acts like (de)lensing, it is called Doppler lensing(20). By observing the distance modulus $\mu(z)$ and computing $\Delta\mu = \mu - \bar{\mu}$, the parameter κ_v and the peculiar velocity are computed by using equation (23) and (21). One can show that relation (18) is the approximate version of relation (20) at low redshifts. In Fig. 2, the solid curve demonstrates relation (23). The distance modulus of the data points are given by Union 2 SNe Ia catalog (30) for $z < 0.2$. $\bar{\mu}$ is computed for Ω_m=0.27, Ω_Λ=0.73 and H_0=70 km/s/Mpc. The coloured symboles represent peculiar velocities computed from relation (18). We have substituted the non-relativistic v_p in relation (21) and plotted $\Delta\mu$ vs. κ_v. The non-relativistic approximation overestimates the absolute value of the peculiar velocities. The overestimation increases by redshift.

We can compare the variation of κ_g and κ_v as function of redshift in Fig. 1. It shows that at low redshift the lensing effect is subdominant and the luminosity deviation from the background model is caused mainly by the peculiar velocities.

To include the effect of changes in gravitational potentials on the luminosity and redshift measurement, we substitute equation (12) in equation (8). By taking into account the relations (9) and (14), we obtain (20):

$$D_L(z) = \bar{d}_L(z)\big[1 - \kappa_v - \kappa_g - \kappa_{SW} - \kappa_{ISW}\big], \tag{24}$$



Fig. 3. Schematic view of the effect of peculiar velocities and gravitational lensing on the background cosmology curve (solid curve). A standard candle, located originally at redshift $\bar{z}$ with unperturbed luminosity distance $\bar{d}_L(\bar{z})$, will be measured at a different redshift (z), due to peculiar velocity, and different luminosity distance (D_L) due to (de)lensing effect. At redshift z, we expect a standard candle to have (unperturbed) luminosity distance $\bar{d}_L(z)$.



Fig. 4. The absolute values of the peculiar velocities (km/s), computed from relation (23) up to z=1.4 for SNe Ia of Union2 catalog. The data (grey boxes) are averaged with bin width of 0.01 redshift (black circles). The error bars show one sigma scatter per bin. No correction due to lensing effect is included.

where $D_L(z)$ is the observed luminosity distance at observed redshift z, and

$$\kappa_{SW}(z) = 2\Phi_s(z) + \frac{c(1+z)}{2H(z)\chi(z)} z_{SW}, \tag{25}$$



Fig. 5. Similar to Fig. 4 but the velocities (km/s) are computed from uncertainties on luminosity measurements of SNe Ia given by union 2 catalog.

$$\kappa_{ISW}(z) = \frac{2}{\chi_s(z)} \int_0^{\chi_s(z)} d\chi \Phi + \frac{2}{c}(1 + \frac{c(1+z)}{H(z)\chi(z)}) \int_0^{\chi_s(z)} d\chi \Phi'. \tag{26}$$

The last equation shows the contribution of the Integrated Sachs-Wolf effect on the luminosity fluctuation. This term contributes more for sources located at high redshifts. At low and intermediate redshifts ($z < 2$), we neglect κ_{SW} and κ_{ISW}.

2.3. Luminosity distance with peculiar velocity in a clumpy universe

Consider an unperturbed FRW Universe where the luminosity distances of the celestial objects are described by equation (4). For the sources located at intermediate redshift, the existence of voids and clumps can perturb equation (4) in two ways:

1. The lensing effect of line-of-sight structures keeps the comoving redshift unchanged and changes the source background luminosity, through relation (11).
2. The peculiar velocity, induced locally by nearby structures of the host galaxy, keeps the (de)lensed luminosity unchanged and perturbs the comoving redshift from $\bar{z}$ to z (Doppler lensing) through relation (20). These effects are schematically shown in Fig. 3. Consider an object located at comoving redshift $\bar{z}$ with background luminosity distance $\bar{d}_L(\bar{z})$. We observe the same object at redshift z and luminosity distance $D_L(z)$. From Fig. 3, we have $D_L(z) = d_L(\bar{z})$ (lensing is the only cause of (de)magnifying the background luminosity). By neglecting the SW and ISW effects, we will

have:

$$D_L(z) = \bar{d}_L(z)\,[1 - \kappa_v - \kappa_g]\,, \tag{27}$$

We now have all the elements to compute the peculiar velocity at the observed redshift z:

$$v_p/c = (1 - \kappa_g - \frac{D_L(z)}{\bar{d}_L(z)})(\frac{c(1+z)}{\chi(z)H(z)} - 1)^{-1} \tag{28}$$

For $\kappa_g = 0$, we arrive at equation (23) where $\mu(z) = 5\log D_L(z) + 25$. Measuring the peculiar redshift from the observed $D_L(z)$ (or $\mu(z)$) by the method described in the previous section (Eq.(23)) will obviously overestimate the peculiar velocity. This is because by assuming $\mu(z) = \bar{\mu}(\bar{z})$, we are attributing all of the deviation from the Hubble diagram to redshift-space distortion, neglecting the gravitational (de)lensing.

Moreover, by increasing the observed redshift, $|z - \bar{z}|$ increases and the expansion (12) is not valid anymore. At redshift $\bar{z} \sim 1$, a convergence factor $\kappa_g \sim 0.1$ can induce luminosity fluctuation $|\Delta\mu| \sim 0.2$. If we neglect the lensing effect and compute the peculiar velocity through Eq. (23) with $\Delta\mu$ =0.2, we end up with $v_p \sim$ 10,000 km/s which is unrealistic. Although we do not have yet access to the convergence map at higher redshifts, we can examine the contribution of the κ_g exclusion factor on the peculiar velocity as an over-estimation. We assume SNe Ia as standard candles and use the union 2 catalog to compute the peculiar velocities of the SNe host galaxies up to redshift 1.4 neglecting the convergence.

Figure 4 shows the computed peculiar velocity versus redshift for SNe Ia from Union 2 catalog. The lensing effect is neglected and the velocities are computed from relations (23), (21) and (15). As can be illustrated, the velocities are $\sim$ 1000 km/s for $z < 0.15$ and then increase dramatically with z for higher redshifts. Unfortunately, based on the current precision of the luminosity measurement of SNe Ia, we can not assign the observed velocity excess to the lensing effect confidently. Figure 5 shows the peculiar velocities produced by the uncertainties (error bars) of the observed distance moduli. This means in relation (23), we replaced $\Delta\mu(z)$ by the error bar of the SN distance modului and computed the corresponding peculiar velocity. As can be seen, both figures 4 and 5 show the same trends. This is equivalent to say that the uncertainties on SNe Ia luminosity are still large-enough that the deviations from the background (ΛCDM) model are not statistically significant. Furthermore, even for z <0.15, the velocities produced by pure uncertainties on the observed distance moduli are larger than the one produced by $\Delta\mu(z)$. This shows that our peculiar velocity measurements are not sufficiently precise due to, once again, the large uncertainties on SNe Ia luminosity measurement.

3. Conclusion and future prospects

Considering the FRW metric and the ΛCDM model, one can obtain the luminosity distance as a function of the cosmological redshift. At low redshifts, the deviation of the observed luminosity distance from the model prediction is attributed to the source peculiar velocity induced by local structures around the source. The peculiar velocity is obtained by computing the amount of difference in the luminosity distance in the ΛCDM model. Using less model-dependent methods, such as linear theory, can help us to derive the peculiar velocity by considering the matter distribution around the source. Such methods lead us to re-examine the cosmological models according to model predictions for the peculiar velocities (7). As we approach intermediate redshifts, the lensing effect of the line-of-sight structures gets stronger. The deviations of the luminosity distance from the model, caused by gravitational convergence, become comparable to the effect of peculiar velocities. Therefore, to compute the peculiar velocity, one should firstly correct the luminosity distance for the (de)lensing effect. We showed that with the present data of the standard candles, it is not yet possible to extract the contribution of the peculiar velocity and the gravitational lensing on the luminosity deviation from the background ΛCDM model. This is essentially due to the rather large (systematic) uncertainties in SNe Ia data. These uncertainties prevent us from precise measurement of the peculiar velocity even at low redshifts. However, including the effect of cosmic convergence on peculiar velocities is crucial for future surveys (such as LSST (28) and Euclid (29)). These surveys will map cosmic structures up to intermediate redshifts where gravitational lensing plays an important role.

4. Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Joseph Silk, Roya Mohayaee and Marc Moniez for their insightful comments and useful discussions. We thank R. Mansouri and S.M. Mahdavi for facilitating the stay of FH at Sharif University of Technology. The research of FH at IAP is supported by a grant from the International Balzan Foundation via the Oxford New College-Johns Hopkins University Center for Cosmological Studies.

References

[1] A. G. Riess *et al.* [Supernova Search Team Collaboration], "Observational evidence from supernovae for an accelerating universe and a cosmological constant," Astron. J. **116**, 1009 (1998) [astro-ph/9805201].

[2] S. Perlmutter *et al.* [Supernova Cosmology Project Collaboration], "Measurements of Omega and Lambda from 42 high redshift supernovae," Astrophys. J. **517**, 565 (1999) [astro-ph/9812133].

[3] M. Bartelmann and P. Schneider, "Weak gravitational lensing," Phys. Rept. **340**, 291 (2001) [astro-ph/9912508].

[4] C. Bonvin, R. Durrer and M. A. Gasparini, "Fluctuations of the luminosity distance," Phys. Rev. D **73**, 023523 (2006) [Phys. Rev. D **85**, 029901 (2012)] doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.85.029901, 10.1103/PhysRevD.73.023523 [astro-ph/0511183].

[5] T. M. Davis, L. Hui, J. A. Frieman, T. Haugbolle, R. Kessler, B. Sinclair, J. Sollerman and B. Bassett *et al.*, "The effect of peculiar velocities on supernova cosmology," Astrophys. J. **741**, 67 (2011) [arXiv:1012.2912 [astro-ph.CO]].

[6] J. Koda, C. Blake, T. Davis, C. Magoulas, C. M. Springob, M. Scrimgeour, A. Johnson and G. B. Poole *et al.*, "Are peculiar velocity surveys competitive as a cosmological probe?," arXiv:1312.1022 [astro-ph.CO].

[7] S. Baghram, S. Tavasoli, F. Habibi, R. Mohayaee and J. Silk, "Unraveling the nature of Gravity through our clumpy Universe," arXiv:1411.7010 [astro-ph.CO].
[8] N. Kaiser, "Theoretical implications of deviations from Hubble flow," Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **231**, 149 (1989).
[9] A. Dekel, "Dynamics of cosmic flows," Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys. **32**, 371 (1994) [astro-ph/9401022].
[10] M. A. Strauss and J. A. Willick, "The Density and peculiar velocity fields of nearby galaxies," Phys. Rept. **261**, 271 (1995) [astro-ph/9502079].
[11] K. L. Masters, C. M. Springob, M. P. Haynes and R. Giovanelli, "SFI++ I: A New I-band Tully-Fisher Template, the Cluster Peculiar Velocity Dispersion and H0," Astrophys. J. **653**, 861 (2006) [astro-ph/0609249].
[12] D. Sarkar, H. A. Feldman and R. Watkins, "Bulk flows from velocity field surveys: A Consistency check," Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **375**, 691 (2007) [astro-ph/0607426].
[13] A. Abate, S. Bridle, L. F. A. Teodoro, M. S. Warren and M. Hendry, "Peculiar Velocities into the Next Generation: Cosmological Parameters From Large Surveys without Bias from Nonlinear Structure," arXiv:0802.1935 [astro-ph].
[14] G. Lavaux, R. Mohayaee, S. Colombi, R. B. Tully, F. Bernardeau and J. Silk, "Observational biases in Lagrangian reconstructions of cosmic velocity fields," [arXiv:0707.3483 [astro-ph]].
[15] A. Nusser and M. Davis, "The cosmological bulk flow: consistency with ΛCDM and $z \approx 0$ constraints on σ_8 and γ," Astrophys. J. **736**, 93 (2011) [arXiv:1101.1650 [astro-ph.CO]].
[16] R. B. Tully and J. R. Fisher, "A New method of determining distances to galaxies," Astron. Astrophys. **54**, 661 (1977).
[17] J. L. Tonry, A. Dressler, J. P. Blakeslee, E. A. Ajhar, A. B. Fletcher, G. A. Luppino, M. R. Metzger and C. B. Moore, "The sbf survey of galaxy distances. 4. Sbf magnitudes, colors, and distances," Astrophys. J. **546**, 681 (2001) [astro-ph/0011223].
[18] S. M. Faber and R. E. Jackson, "Velocity dispersions and mass to light ratios for elliptical galaxies," Astrophys. J. **204**, 668 (1976).
[19] W. L. Freedman *et al.* [HST Collaboration], "Final results from the Hubble Space Telescope key project to measure the Hubble constant," Astrophys. J. **553**, 47 (2001) [astro-ph/0012376].
[20] D. J. Bacon, S. Andrianomena, C. Clarkson, K. Bolejko and R. Maartens, "Cosmology with Doppler Lensing," arXiv:1401.3694 [astro-ph.CO].
[21] T. M. Davis and M. I. Scrimgeour, "Deriving accurate peculiar velocities (even at high redshift)," arXiv:1405.0105 [astro-ph.CO].
[22] D. E. Holz and E. V. Linder, "Safety in numbers: Gravitational lensing degradation of the luminosity distance-redshift relation," Astrophys. J. **631**, 678 (2005) [astro-ph/0412173].
[23] S. Hilbert, J. Hartlap, S. D. M. White and P. Schneider, "Ray-tracing through the Millennium Simulation: Born corrections and lens-lens coupling in cosmic shear and galaxy-galaxy lensing," Astron. Astrophys. **499**, 31 (2009) [arXiv:0809.5035 [astro-ph]].
[24] I. Ben-Dayan, M. Gasperini, G. Marozzi, F. Nugier and G. Veneziano, "Average and dispersion of the luminosity-redshift relation in the concordance model," JCAP **1306**, 002 (2013) [arXiv:1302.0740 [astro-ph.CO]].
[25] K. Bolejko and P. G. Ferreira, "Ricci focusing, shearing, and the expansion rate in an almost homogeneous Universe," JCAP **1205**, 003 (2012) [arXiv:1204.0909 [astro-ph.CO]].
[26] Y. -Z. Ma and D. Scott, "Velocities hasten to tell us about the Universe," Astron. Geophys. **55**, 3 (2014) [arXiv:1406.1136 [astro-ph.CO]].
[27] R. K. Sachs and A. M. Wolfe, "Perturbations of a cosmological model and angular variations of the microwave background," Astrophys. J. **147**, 73 (1967) [Gen. Rel. Grav. **39**, 1929 (2007)].
[28] P. A. Abell *et al.* [LSST Science and LSST Project Collaborations], "LSST Science Book, Version 2.0," arXiv:0912.0201 [astro-ph.IM].
[29] L. Amendola *et al.* [Euclid Theory Working Group Collaboration], "Cosmology and fundamental physics with the Euclid satellite," Living Rev. Rel. **16** (2013) 6 [arXiv:1206.1225 [astro-ph.CO]].
[30] R. Amanullah, C. Lidman, D. Rubin, G. Aldering, P. Astier, K. Barbary, M. S. Burns and A. Conley et al., Spectra and Light Curves of Six Type Ia Supernovae at 0.511 z 1.12 and the Union2 Compilation, Astrophys. J. 716, 712 (2010) [arXiv:1004.1711 [astro-ph.CO]].
[31] H. Guo, Z. Zheng, I. Zehavi, P. S. Behroozi, C. H. Chuang, J. Comparat, G. Favole and S. Gottloeber *et al.*, "Redshift-Space Clustering of SDSS Galaxies — Luminosity Dependence, Halo Occupation Distribution, and Velocity Bias," arXiv:1505.07861 [astro-ph.CO].